

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
EASTERN DIVISION

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------|
| DAVID FRANKLIN COTNEY, JR., |) | |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Civil Action No. |
| |) | 3:07cv46-WHA-CSC |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |

ORDER

Pursuant to the orders of this court, the United States filed a response (Doc. No. 6) addressing the claims presented by the petitioner in his § 2255 motion. In its response, the government argues that the petitioner's claims are without merit and provide no basis for relief. Specifically, the government maintains that the petitioner's claims of ineffective assistance of counsel rest on allegations that are refuted by the record in this case. The government further argues that these allegations fail to establish either deficient performance or prejudice within the meaning of *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984).

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that on or before March 8, 2007, the petitioner may file a reply to the response filed by the United States. Any documents or evidence filed after this date will not be considered by the court except upon a showing of exceptional circumstances. At any time after March 8, 2007, the court shall "determine whether an evidentiary hearing is required. If it appears that an evidentiary hearing is not required, the [court] shall make such

disposition of the motion as justice dictates.” Rule 8(a), *Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings in the United States District Courts*.

The petitioner is instructed that when responding to the assertions contained in the government’s response, he may file sworn affidavits or other documents in support of his claims. Affidavits should set forth specific facts that demonstrate that the petitioner is entitled to relief on the grounds presented in his § 2255 motion. If documents that have not previously been filed with the court are referred to in the affidavits, sworn or certified copies of those papers must be attached to the affidavits or served with them. When the petitioner attacks the government’s response by use of affidavits or other documents, the court will, at the appropriate time, consider whether to expand the record to include such materials. *See Rule 7, Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings in the United States District Courts*. The petitioner is advised that upon expiration of the time for filing a response to this order, the court will proceed to consider the merits of the pending § 2255 motion pursuant to Rule 8(a).

Done this 15th day of February, 2007.

/s/Charles S. Coody
CHARLES S. COODY
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE